a software agent, where the agent is located on a deputization point coupled to the directory service, and where the directory service comprises the rights of a software principal to a resource. The rights to an access control list cache are updated by the agent. The access control list cache is coupled to the deputization point and to the principal. A request from the principal for the rights is received at the access control list cache. The rights are retrieved by the access control list cache and forwarded to the principal.

In contrast, the cited text of O'Conner describes a person (e.g., a user) seeking access to a computer network (col. 7, lines 65-67). The person provides identifying information after appearing at a designated location (col. 8, lines 2-9). The person then receives and installs special software to access a host, or is allowed to access a special terminal (col. 8, lines 27-34). Nowhere in the cited text can Applicant find any teaching or suggestion for all of the elements of claim 1 as required by MPEP § 2143.

For example, Applicant cannot find a teaching or suggestion for a directory service that comprises the rights of a software principal to a resource, a software agent that is located on a deputization point coupled to the directory service, or an access control list cache that is coupled to the deputization point and to the principal. Not only does O'Conner not teach or suggest these elements, but O'Conner actually teaches away from Applicant's disclosure. While O'Conner contemplates the use of software, O'Conner's access authorization procedure relies on in-person identification (col. 8, lines 2-9), which is in sharp contrast to the method of claim 1. Accordingly, O'Conner fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claim 1, as required by MPEP § 2143, and claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

As stated in the Office action, because O'Conner fails to teach updating a user's rights, O'Conner is combined with Chang. However, Chang not only fails to remedy the deficiencies of O'Conner, but the combination of O'Conner and Chang actually teaches away from Applicant's disclosure.

Like O'Conner, Chang fails to teach or suggest a directory service that comprises the rights of a software principal to a resource, a software agent that is located on a deputization point coupled to the directory service, or an access control list cache that is coupled to the deputization point and to the principal. Accordingly, the combination of

Chang and O'Conner fails to satisfy the requirement of MPEP § 2143 that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Furthermore, the combination of O'Conner and Chang actually teaches away from Applicant's disclosure by requiring in-person authentication. Accordingly, one skilled in the art following the teaching of O'Conner and Chang would implement a system in which a user must appear in person for purposes of access authorization.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of O'Conner and Chang is improper. According to MPEP § 2143.01, "[o]bviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.... The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination."

The case law is clear that there must be evidence that a skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed. It is also clear that a rejection cannot be predicated on the mere identification of individual components of claimed limitations. Rather, particular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed. *Ecolochem Inc. v. Southern California Edison*, 56 USPQ2d 1065, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Here, no such evidence has been presented. In addition, there is absolutely no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to support the combination of O'Conner and Chang. There is also absolutely no evidence that supports how Chang's updating of rights is to be utilized in O'Conner's in-person access authorization procedure.

Finally, the case law makes it clear that the best defense against hindsight-based obviousness analysis is the rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of a teaching or motivation to combine the prior art references. *See Dembiczak*, 50

USPQ2d, 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). "Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability – the essence of hindsight." *Id.* It is respectfully submitted that the only way O'Conner and Chang could be pieced together to defeat patentability is indeed to use Applicant's disclosure as a blueprint.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of O'Conner and Chang. Claims 2-10 depend from and further limit claim 1 and so are also allowable.

Claim 11 recites, in part, means for accessing, by an agent, a first set of rights of a principal to a resource; means for updating, by the agent, the first set of rights to an access control list cache; means for receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the first set of rights; means for retrieving, by the access control list cache, the first set of rights; and means for forwarding, to the principal, the first set of rights.

Claim 15, as amended, recites in part a method comprising accessing, by a software agent, a directory service, where the agent is located on a deputization point coupled to the directory service having the rights of at least one principal to at least one resource. The agent updates the rights to an access control list cache, where the access control list cache is coupled to the deputization point, and where the access control list cache is coupled to the principal. The access control list cache receives a request from the principal for the rights, the access control list cache retrieves the rights, and the rights are forwarded to the principal.

Claim 19 recites, in part, a principal, an agent, a resource, an access control list cache, a first set of rights, and a second set of rights. The principal, the agent, the resource, and the access control list cache exchange information relating to the first set of rights and the second set of rights. The claim includes means for accessing the first set of rights of the principal to the resource, means for updating the first set of rights to the access control list cache, means for receiving a request from the principal for the first set of rights, means for retrieving the first set of rights, and means for forwarding the first set of rights to the principal.

Claims 11, 15, and 19 each include elements that are not taught or suggested by the combination of Chang and O'Conner as described above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, the combination fails to satisfy the requirement of MPEP § 2143 that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Claims 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 depend from and further limit their respective independent claims, and are also allowable.

Conclusion

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11, 15, and 19 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 11, 15, and 19 and therefore are allowable as well.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy F. Bliss

Timothy F. Bliss
Registration No. 50,925

Dated: December 12, 2002
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 972/739-8638
Facsimile: 972/692-9101
File: 26530.4
r-35720_1.DOC

27683
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, Box Non-Fee Amendment, Washington, D.C. 20231

on December 12, 2002

Gayle Conner

Gayle Conner

Marked-up Claims Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.121

1. (Amended) A method for caching and accessing rights in a distributed computing system, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing, by [an] a software agent, a directory service, wherein the agent is located on a deputization point coupled to the directory service, and wherein the directory service comprises the rights of a software principal to a resource;

updating, by the agent, the rights to an access control list cache, wherein the access control list cache is coupled to the deputization point and to the principal;

receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the rights;

retrieving, by the access control list cache, the rights; and

forwarding, to the principal, the rights.

15. (Amended) A computer storage medium having a configuration that represents data and instructions which will cause performance of method steps for caching and accessing rights in a distributed computing system, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing, by [an] a software agent, a directory service, wherein the agent is located on a deputization point coupled to the directory service having the rights of at least one principal to at least one resource;

updating, by the agent, the rights to an access control list cache, wherein the access control list cache is coupled to the deputization point, and wherein the access control list cache is coupled to the principal;

receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the rights;

retrieving, by the access control list cache, the rights; and

forwarding, to the principal, the rights.